



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The digestion experiments offer nothing of special interest in this connection, and we pass at once to the experiments upon the nutritive value of the digested cellulose. These were so arranged as to compare the effect of the latter with that of an equal weight of sugar in two respects: 1<sup>o</sup>, as to its influence upon the protein metabolism of the body; and, 2<sup>o</sup>, as to its influence upon the gain or loss of fat.

The influence of carbohydrates in the food, as is well known, is to decrease the protein metabolism, as is shown by the diminished excretion of nitrogen in the urine. In v. Knieriem's experiments, 22 grams of crude fibre, of which 11.02 grams were digested, decreased the protein metabolism by 22%, while 11 grams of cane-sugar decreased it 15.3%: in other words, the digestible crude fibre showed itself more effective in this respect than an equal weight of sugar.

As regards the gain or loss of fat, the advantage is on the side of the sugar; the latter diminishing the daily loss from the body by 2.5 grams, while the cellulose decreased it by 1.7 grams.

These are the results of a single experiment, and, as regards exact numerical values, are of course subject to correction by future investigations. They certainly show, however, that the nutritive value of cellulose is by no means insignificant, and probably not very much below that of other carbohydrates. If, as in the former article, we assume that the heat evolved by the fermentation of the cellulose in the alimentary canal is of use to the organism, then the sole loss by the fermentation is the latent energy carried off in the marsh-gas evolved. In that paper the amount of that loss was estimated on the basis of Henneberg and Stohmann's determinations of the amount of marsh-gas excreted in their respiration experiments. If, instead of this, the amount of marsh-gas evolved in the fermentation of one gram of cellulose be made the basis of the calculation, a somewhat lower value for the cellulose results. According to Tappeiner, one gram of cellulose yields 0.335 grams CO<sub>2</sub>, 0.047 grams CH<sub>4</sub>, and 0.618 grams of organic acids. One gram of cellulose yields 4,452 cal.; 0.047 grams CH<sub>4</sub>, 614 cal.: leaving 3,838 cal. to represent the available heat-value of the cellulose. One gram of cane-sugar yields 4,173 cal.; one gram of starch, 4,479 cal.: consequently, if our fundamental assumption is correct, the value of one gram of cellulose is about 92% of that of cane-sugar, and about 86% of that of starch. These results agree well with those of v. Knieriem's experiments; and the two together appear to justify the conclusion, previously stated, that the nutritive value of cellulose is not greatly inferior to that of other carbohydrates.

H. P. ARMSBY.

#### The naval observatory publications.

Referring to your criticism in *Science* for April 3, on the delay in printing annual volumes of 'Astronomical and meteorological observations' made at the U. S. naval observatory, I am glad to be able to say that the cause for complaint in this direction has been, at least temporarily, removed; and in future we hope to have our volumes printed as fast as the limited number of computers will permit the proof-sheets to be sent to the printer.

During the closing days of congress, the following resolution was introduced and concurred in: "That the annual volume of the 'Astronomical and meteorological observations' of the naval observatory for the years 1881 and 1882 be printed, and that 2,000 additional copies of each volume be printed, of which 400

copies will be for the use of the senate, 800 for the use of the house, and 800 for the use of the navy department, or for sale at the cost of paper and printing."

The manuscript sheets of the volume for 1881 are now in the hands of the printer, to be followed immediately by those for 1882; so that both of these volumes will be distributed this year, and it is hoped that we will continue to be able to have (as you very pertinently suggest) all annual volumes printed independently of the regular appropriation for the navy department.

ALLAN D. BROWN,  
Commander, U. S. navy.

U. S. naval observatory, Washington, D.C.,  
April 6.

#### An attempt to photograph the corona.

Mr. Pickering's interesting experiments described in *Science* for April 3 would seem to be practically conclusive as to the unreality of the coronal forms which appear upon the plates of Dr. Huggins and Mr. Woods, if it were evident that he had observed all the conditions which they indicate as essential.

His letter, however, is silent in respect to one important point. It is not stated whether or not the plates were 'backed' with any light-absorbing substance, in order to prevent the so-called 'halation' produced by reflection from the back surface of the plate under a strong light. The English observers insist urgently upon the necessity of this precaution, and use for the purpose, I believe, a coat of asphalt varnish, colored with Brunswick black. It is possible that even this expedient would not wholly prevent a streaky scattering of light at the edge of the sun's image, because minute particles of foreign matter embedded in the glass itself would have their influence; but it is obvious, that, if the experiment was tried without the precaution, it cannot be looked upon as any way decisive.

Perhaps Mr. Pickering would kindly supplement his communication by a brief statement regarding this point.

C. A. YOUNG.

Princeton, N.J., April 8.

In reply to Professor Young's communication, I would say that the precaution to which he refers was carefully attended to, and that all the plates employed were backed the day before the eclipse with asphalt varnish. It would be very interesting to know how far the corona, as photographed by Dr. Huggins, extends from the sun: for a very long exposure would probably mask the real phenomenon; one that was very short would be insufficient to obtain an impression of it. My exposures were so timed, that, by a long development, the darkening could be traced to a distance of .8 of the sun's diameter, while, with a short development, the darkening only reached to .2. But in no case could any particular rays be identified in the different photographs.

WM. H. PICKERING.

#### Sir William Thomson's Molecular dynamics.

As it is possible that some of your readers may have obtained copies of the papyrograph report of my lectures on molecular dynamics, delivered at Baltimore during October, 1884, I should be obliged by your giving publicity to the following corrections:—

P. 34, lines 18 and 19, delete 'We may call it a dynamax but not a paradox.' I have no recollection of, nor can I imagine, what the word was that I suggested as more logical than 'paradox.'